

09/665,846

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application in view of the present amendment is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 7, 13, 14, 19, and 25-28 are amended. Accordingly, claims 1, 2, 7, 13, 14, 19, and 25-28 are pending.

Claims 1, 2, 7, 13, 14, 19, and 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 101 for reasons stated in the Office Action. Claims 1, 2, 7, 13, 14, 19, and 25-28 are drafted with the Section 101 rejection in mind. It is believed that all of the bases for the Section 101 rejection are overcome.

Claims 1, 2, 7, 13; 14, 19, and 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1, 2, 7, 13, 14, 19, and 25-28 are drafted with the Section 112 rejection in mind. It is believed that all of the bases for the Section 101 rejection are overcome.

Claims 1, 2, 7, 13, 14, 19, 27, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,863,214 to Garner, IV (referred to herein as "Garner").

Applicant would like to point out that the rejection of claims 1, 2, 7, 13, 14, 19, and 25-28 is improper for at least the reasons explained hereinbelow.

First, Applicant notes that the Office Action refers to various portions of columns 2, 3, 4, and 5 of the specification of Garner to reject the claims of the present application. In this regard, Applicant would like to point out that it is clear from the specification of Garner, including those portions of columns 2, 3, 4, and 5 cited in the Office Action, that the tracer group slips being processed are actual physical document items and not logical document items (see in particular column 2, lines 35-39 and lines 54-56 and column 3, lines 16-22 of the specification of Garner).

Second, nowhere in the specification of Garner is there a disclosure or suggestion of the tracer group slips being logical document items. Logical document items are non-physical items and do not exist in physical form. In this regard, while it should be clear that "logical" document items do not comprise physical document items, Applicant has amended

09/665,846

the claims of the present application to include the term "non-physical" to more clearly recite this feature of the present invention.

If the Office continues to reject claims 1, 2, 7, 13, 14, 19, 27, and 28 of the present application by applying Garner, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner (i) specifically point out where Garner discloses or suggests using non-physical, logical tracer group items, and (ii) specifically point out where Garner discloses or suggests using non-physical, logical tracer group items in place of actual physical tracer group items. Absent an adequate explanation, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 1, 2, 7, 13, 14, 19, 27, and 28 of the present application is improper and, therefore, should be withdrawn.

Claims 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garner in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,381,342 to Foley.

Applicant would like to point out that the rejection of claims 25 and 26 is improper for at least the reasons explained hereinbelow.

First, Applicant's explanation above with respect to claims 1, 2, 7, 13, 14, 19, 27, and 28 of the present application is also applicable to claims 25 and 26 of the present application.

Second, the disclosure of Foley does not cure the deficiencies of Garner. Recall that Foley was cited in the Office Action for a batch header having a unique number.

If the Office continues to reject claims 25 and 26 of the present application by applying Garner and Foley, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner (i) specifically point out where either Garner or Foley discloses or suggests using non-physical, logical tracer group items, and (ii) specifically point out where either Garner or Foley discloses or suggests using non-physical, logical tracer group items in place of actual physical tracer group items. Absent an adequate explanation, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 25 and 26 of the present application is improper and, therefore, should be withdrawn.

09/665,846

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance, and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael Chan
Reg. No. 33,663
Attorney for Applicant

NCR Corporation, Law Department, WHQ-3E
1700 S. Patterson Blvd., Dayton, OH 45479-0001
Tel. No. 937-445-4956/Fax No. 937-445-6794